DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 001 CS 206 144

AUTHOR Stull, William L.
TITLE Learning to Teach: Teaching to Learn.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; *English Teacher Education; History; Literature Reviews; Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT

This state-of-the-art report reviews the development of a philosophy of composition instruction through the decade of the 1970s in three principal forms--proclamations, do-it-yourself formulas, and research--and cites extensive examples of each. It stresses that composition teachers must continue to learn about their profession, while they resist any efforts to divide English departments into separate entities of literature, composition, and speech. A decade of evolving English teacher training programs is also described, with four approaches specifically cited. (AEA)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED202001

William L. Stull
Department of English
University of Hartford
West Hartford, CT 06117
(203) 243-4314

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William L. Stull

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# Learning to Teach: Teaching to Learn

William L. Stull

"First," the editor observed, "I think most people will agree that virtually no academic subject gets taught in such a variety of ways as does composition, many of those ways mutually incompatible in their assumptions. Apparently we have no wide agreement on the nature and purpose of English 101. Secondly, the results of our teaching are at best mixed. How we judge our success depends in part on whether we think of English 101 as teaching students to write fluently, teaching them to think well, preparing them for liberal education, 'exposing' them to some of the best that has been thought and known, helping them to become intelligent citizens, qualifying them for specific careers, or serving one or more of many other announced and covert aims. But even if we agree for a moment on one aim, such as the first, our success in achieving it can be, has been, seriously questioned."

The editor was Richard Ohmann, the magazine was College English, and the year was 1969. Ohmann wrote his note apropos of publishing Robert Zoellner's issue-length monograph "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition" (CE, 30 /Jan. 1969/, 267-320). "In so indistinct a situation as this," he continued, "I think an argument like Mr. Zoellner's, which unpacks and sorts out a lot of conceptual baggage, is particularly valuable. Or should be" (p. 267n). As it turned out, Ohmann was right. For readers of College English the ensuing debate over "Zoellnerism" marked the beginning of the 1970s, a decade that has indeed witnessed much unpacking and sorting out of conceptual baggage about composition.

CS206144

I turn now to a more recent document, one that may sound vividly familiar to now-and-future composition teachers:

> At least 6 Lectureships in Composition (1 year w/renewal possible) for 1980-81 in a new campus-wide writing program, Ph.D. or ABD; teaching load 2 courses per quarter; salary ca. $17,500; teaching opportunities in grad. and professional schools, faculty/staff programs, upper and lower division undergrad. writing programs, teacher trainer program; TV and computer programs. Requirements: Composition exper.; excellent teaching record; interest in writing problems at all levels, course design, and textbook/media development; first class literary training and intelligence.

The author is Richard A. Lanham, University Director of Writing at my alma mater, UCLA, and the advertisement comes, of course, from April 1980 MLA Job Information List. While I shall return to that tantalizing final phrase--"first class literary training and intelligence"--forthwith, my principal purpose in this paper is to explain how, in a brief, rather dull decade, composition teaching was transmogrified from "so indistinct a situation" as Ohmann lamented into so booming an enterprise as Lanham touts. In a still broader sense, I hope to answer two questions: What have we learned about teaching composition? and How can we, in turn, teach this wisdom to prospective teachers of college English? To borrow a still larger question from Wayne Booth, Is there any knowledge that a composition teacher must have?

Yes, indeed, there is such knowledge--plenty of it--I believe. It can be taught and learned, and we are already teaching and learning it. In fact, my answer rests on my denial that at this juncture teaching and learning can meaningfully be discussed apart. For me, as a teacher, student, and

supervisor of student-teachers, teaching and learning are reciprocal, isomorphic activities. As motives, their rhetorical relationship is chiastic, hence my title, "Learning to Teach: Teaching to Learn." Thus while I agree with Booth that the first knowledge a person must have is the ability "to learn for himself," I reject Peter Elbow's assumption in Writing Without Teachers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), that there is no "necessary connection between learning and teaching" (p. ix). As anyone who has taught writing knows, the teacher is always a student, and the students, in turn, always teach their teacher new tricks, new humility. In this sense, we are all student-teachers.

But who, exactly, are we training for those six new jobs in the campus-wide writing program, in the faculty/staff programs, and in those TV and computer programs that the ad so bravely emblazons? Surely, many of the applicants will come from that nomadic host of migratory workers whom Jane Flanders eulogized in "The Use and Abuse of Part-Time Faculty" (ADE Bulletin, No. 50 /Sept. 1976/, pp. 49-52). A few will no doubt apply under a name that would have sounded as unfamiliar in 1969 as "Zoellnerism" sounds today. They will be "composition specialists," an English department neologism comparable to the city planner's upgraded "sanitation engineer." Some who fill the new slots may even be Professor Lanham's Parnassian colleagues fallen on hard times, to whom I recommend Richard Larson's handy enchiridion, "Resources for the Veteran Teacher New to Composition" (ADE Bulletin, No. 58 /Sept. 1978/, pp. 28-32). But most of those who send their curricula vitae to Westwood will be, like myself, fresh young Ph.D.'s with just what Professor Lanham ordered: "first class literary training and intelligence"--and no other credentials for the job besides their accumulated hash marks from years in the TA trenches while finishing literary studies. To say the least, these teachers will be learners.

And the "campus-wide writing program" that they enter will look much different from the English departments they entered about the time the debate over Zoellnerism was cooling down; that is, about the time the debate over Elbowism was heating up. The latest NCTE Statement on the Preparation of Teachers of English and Language Arts (CE, 40 /Sept. 1978/), 70-82, sums up the heavy change succinctly:

> In the middle sixties, when the Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English were being developed, "English" was defined by the College Entrance Examination Board's Commission on English as a discipline comprising language, literature, and composition--the familiar 'tripod.' Today, that metaphor has all but disappeared as a definition of English; our subject is viewed not only as a body of knowledge and as a set of skills and attitudes but also as a process, an activity--something one does (i.e., one uses and responds to language, in a variety of ways in a variety of contexts). In the mid-sixties, English was viewed mainly as an academic discipline, whose mastery was a sign of one's intellectual development. Today, many teachers agree that using English is also a means by which students grow emotionally; students respond to their experiences and learn about their worlds, their feelings, their attitudes, and themselves by using language about these subjects." (pp. 71-72)

This shift of our attention from the written product to the writing process--a Copernican revolution, I shall argue--has indeed changed the discipline of English and its teaching. And for many teachers trained in literature but hired in composition, what John Donne observed of the first Copernican revolution holds true: "the new Philosophy cals all in doubt,/The Element of fire is quite put out" (The First Anniversary ll. 205-206). The new Philosophy of Composition--Not Poe's but E. D Hirsch's-- indeed calls our

traditional enterprise into doubt, and it is no wonder our introspective profession has grown even more introspective of late.

Still, The Copernican revolution, though mortally frightening to the powers-that-were, set into motion a whole new science. Not surprisingly, some of our own Renaissance men--Hirsch, Lanham, and Ong--as well as such Renaissance women as Janet Emig and the late Mina Shaughnessy--have described our time as a second Renaissance, or, more in the American grain, as a new frontier.

The threat, of course, is that with all coherence gone, the center cannot hold--to yoke our century and Donne's in one violent allusion. While the 1970s opened up a new world for English teachers which I shall discuss in some detail, the revolution also threatened to unseat the English department from its comfortable Pythian tripod. The studies we call English--the interinanimated arts of reading, writing, and rhetoric--threaten to break apart into separate departments of literature, composition, and speech, each with its own "specialists," but none truly self-sufficient. As no less a literatus than J. Hillis Miller recently observed in an essay with the Arnoldian title "The Functions of Rhetorical Study at the Present time," (in The State of the Discipline 1970s-1980s, ADE Bulletin, No. 62 /Sept.-Nov. 1979/), "The worst catastrophe that could befall the study of English literature would be to allow the programs in expository writing to become separate empires in the universities and colleges, wholly cut off from the departments of English and American literature" (p. 12). Conversely, E. D. Hirsch, Jr., has remarked that "our recent experiment /since about 1950, when the 4C's was established/ at being exclusively professors of literature has been rather a short-lived and unsuccessful one, with unfortunate practical consequences" ("Remarks on Composition to the Yale Faculty,"

in State of the Discipline, p. 64). And while in The Philosophy of Composition (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1977) Hirsch argues that "composition is a craft which cannot properly be subsumed under any conventional subject matter" (p. 140), he nonetheless upholds the historical connection between literature and literacy that stretches back to the time of the first "Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres," Hugh Blair. Surely the greatest tragedy for prospective English teachers would be for them to find themselves not only without jobs but without departments to apply to, the English faculty having declared itself fit for nothing but the teaching of film.

Indeed, the new philosophy of composition calls much of our traditional wisdom into doubt. Hirsch's scientism, his borrowings from educational psychology, psycholinguistics, and all manner of "hard" studies, chagrins many of us bred on the softer arts and sciences. As teachers of English--and as teachers of future teachers--we all too often find ourselves echoing yet another Renaissance man, the very inventor of the belletristic essay, Michel Eyquem de Montaigne. In a field suddenly bristling with t-tests, Latin squares, and multiple regression analyses, English teachers steeped in ambiguity, tension, and irony many well be tempted to throw up their hands and cry "What do I know?"

While I would not yet answer that crie de coeur with Blake's "Enough!--or Too much," I believe that we do indeed know a good deal. In the ten years since Robert Zoellner commandeered a full issue of College English, we have learned much about the teaching and learning of English composition--its conceptual baggage, its political war chests, and its pedagogical carry-on luggage. As many of us vividly recall, the 1960s were the era of the "new" rhetorics: the new generative rhetoric of Francis Christensen, the new tagmemic

rhetoric of Kenneth L. Pike, the new-old classical rhetoric of Edward P. J. Corbett, to name only a few.[1]

Each of these once-new approaches has since borne fruit. But exciting as the new rhetorics were, I believe that when the history of English during our time is written, not the '60s but the '70s will prove to have been the revolutionary period. For teachers of English--broadly defined as teachers of reading, writing, and rhetoric--the 1970s were the decade of discovery--of heuristics, in the new parlance. For it was during these years that English teachers discovered, on the one hand, theory and, on the other, basic writing. And in the words of Merton Densher in Henry James's The Wings of the Dove, "We shall never be again as we were."

In point of fact, it took us almost two years just to sleep off the '60s. Jeffrey P. Neill's essay "Freshman Composition: The 1970s" did not appear in College Composition and Communication until December 1971. Recently, in preparing to teach a graduate seminar for future teachers of composition, I spent a week on the laborious but enlightening task of reviewing the last ten years of College English, CCC, and Research in the Teaching of English, with an occasional glance at the English Journal and Language Arts. What I read ranged from hard statistical studies to soft-core memoirs. To speak of an "information explosion" during these years is not to exaggerate. Every month brings us a new forum on writing, from the Journal of Advanced Composition to the Trio-Share Newsletter. Nonetheless, as one reviews the decade, categories emerge, though distinctions blur. What we have learned about teaching has come in three principal forms: manifestoes, recipes, and--more recently--research.

The manifestoes--"public declarations of motives and intentions by a government or by a person or group regarded as having some public importance,"

to borrow from Webster's New World--tell us much about who we are and how we continually redefine ourselves. The 1960s were, of course, rife with such documents, and we have not lacked for our own. For me, the book that kicked off the decade will always be Leonard A. Greenbaum and Rudolf B. Schmerl's Course X: A Left Field Guide to Freshman English (New York: J. B. Lippencott, 1970), a scathing critique of our whole enterprise and a clarion call for abandoning the fiasco at once:

> Freshman English is not a course: it's a problem.
> And though the profession is professionally unhappy,
> until such times as Acts of War or of God eliminate
> freshman English, the real sufferer, the one who sickens
> and sometimes dies from the symptoms, is the freshman. (ix)

The companion piece to this was, of course, Ken Macrorie's Uptaught (Rochelle Park, N. J.: Hayden, 1970), with its indictment of "Engfish" and the System. Progressive as they seemed at the time, both these manifestoes actually looked backward. What Greenbaum and Schmerl wryly termed the "Voices in the Closet, Skeletons in the Wilderness," were as much creatures of politics as of pedagogy, although a later manifesto was to argue that the two were really one.

I must skim over such fascinating specimens of this genre as Harvey Stuart Irlen's "Toward Confronting Freshmen" (CE, 21 /Feb. 1970/, 35-40) and William D. Lutz's "Making Freshman English a Happening" (CCC, 22 /Feb. 1971/, 35-38; actually an echo of Charles Deemer's 1967 CE essay "English Composition as a Happening." Even revisionist history repeats itself.) in order to concentrate on milestones. Among these for 1972 I would include Donald C. Stewart's book The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing Approach to Student Writing (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1972), a forward-looking treatise with debts to D. Gordon Rohman's classic essay, "Pre-Writing: The Stage of

Discovery in the Writing Process" (CCC, 16 /May 1965/. 106-112), and Brent Harold's "Beyond Student-Centered Teaching: The Dialectial Materialist Form of a Literature Course" (CE, 34 /Nov. 1972/, 200-212), an essay which shook me up at the time but which now seems humorously humorless. 1973 saw the appearance of Peter Elbow's Writing Without Teachers, a transitional document, I believe, written between two worlds, and Mina P. Shaughnessy's "Open Admissions and the Disadvantaged Teacher" (CCC, 24 /Dec. 1973/, 401-04), a prophecy. The next year the roads were clearly diverging in directions that are now familiar to us. the NCTE published its own little manifesto, Students' Right to Their Own Language (CCC, 25 /Fall 1974/), and Professor Lanham published his: Style: An Anti-Textbook (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1974). Clearly, the answer to Regina M. Hoover's query "Taps for Freshman English?" (CCC, 25 /May 1974/, 149-54) was no.

Apparently we decided to rest and regroup during 1975, since I find no proclamation of note for that year. Even 1976 was largely a year of stock-taking, with Macrorie revising Telling Writing (Rochelle Park, N.J. Hayden, 1976), and Richard Ohmann mounting a last assault on the System in English in America: A Radical View of the Profession (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976), a book born ten years too late. As a coda to this introspective, self-critical period, I cite David R. Pichaske's meditation "Freshman English: What is This Shit?" (CE, 38/Oct. 1976/, 117-24). Clearly, the stillness promised a storm.

The storm broke in that annus mirabilis 1977, a year of wonders from which we have not yet recovered nor are likely to for some time. The two genuinely revolutionary books of the decade appeared as fraternal twins, distinct but coeval. The first was Hirsch's Philosophy of Composition and the second was, of course, Ms. Shaughnessy's Errors and Expectations: A

Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977). These writers are our true Kepler and Galileo, and so far all our subsequent manifestoes have been footnotes to them.[2] We wait, trembling, for God to say, "Let Newton be!"

Recipes--practical, do-it-yourself formulae for everything from "A System for Teaching College Freshmen to Write a Research Paper" (by Colleen Marshall in CE, 40 /Sept. 1978/, 87-89) to "Teaching the Nominative Absolute" (by Martha Solomon in CCC, 26 /Dec. 1975/, 356-61) we have long had in superabundance. And to call such handy how-to's "recipes" (Carol Naab's recent Help! From One to Another /Dallas: Taylor Publishing Co., 1979/ looks distinctly like a church auxiliary cookbook) is not to bury them but to praise them. They work. Furthermore, cookbooks like Richard Ohmann's Ideas for English 101: Teaching Writing in College (Urbana: NCTE, 1975) are really the cool flip-sides of manifestoes like English in America. No student-teacher should be left without a copy of Littleton Long's Writing Exercises From Exercise Exchange (Urbana: NCTE, 1976) or Gene Stanford's recent Classroom Practices collections. In fact, little treatises like Carl Koch and James M. Brazil's Strategies for Teaching the Composition Process (Urbana: NCTE, 1978) bridge the gap between established practice and exciting research--my next topic.

Research--systematic, quantifiable, verifiable investigation--is nothing new to English education. The journal Research in the Teaching of English grew up in the '60s. But for many teachers of college English, so apt, as Elizabeth Wooton Cowan has pointed out, to holler, "Fractions Make My Head Hurt" (CE, 38 /Jan. 1977/, 640-65), such hard stuff is indeed new philosophy, capable of calling all into question. But as James J. Kinney wisely warns in "'Scientism' and the Teaching of English" in Walker Gibson's New Students

in Two-Year Colleges (Urbana: NCTE, 1979), "Science and humanism are not opposites. We are not forced into an either/or choice between them. In their highest forms they actually merge and give the world an Einstein or a Schweitzer" (p. 11). What science and humanism alike oppose is irrationalism, whether that takes the form of hidebound tradition or groundless faith. The 1970s have been profoundly revolutionary in this respect, as the arts and sciences, so often opposed during the 1960s, began more and more to cooperate in the classroom. Here my history can be but a sketch. I shall, however, highlight what I consider to have been outstanding work. Furthermore, I shall propose that in the second half of the decade we moved beyond research into something more valuable still, into theory.

Along with the new rhetorics, the 1960s produced a wealth of educational research that laid a groundwork for things to come: Kellogg W. Hunt's Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels (NCTE Research Report, No. 3 /1965/); James Moffett's Teaching the Universe of Discourse (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968); and Zoellner's "Talk-Write" (1969); as well as Young, Becker, and Pike's practical application of tagmemic theory in Rhetoric: Discovery and Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970). In conjunction with the last, we may also recall Janice Lauer's essay "Heuristics and Composition" (CCC, 21/Dec. 1970/, 396-404), a study that anticipates our renewed interest in rhetorical invention. In retrospect, however, the true Copernicus of our age was Janet Emig, whose monograph The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (NCTE Research Report, No. 13) appeared in 1971. I call Ms. Emig our Copernicus because, more than any other, her work has radically restructured our universe of discourse. Copernicus moved the earth around the sun where before the sun had circled the earth. Later, Immanuel Kant claimed to have effected a similar revolution in philosophy by moving things around the

knower where formerly the knower had moved around things. Ms. Emig's work moved our attention from the written product to the writing process, thus inverting our traditional model for the teaching of English. In one way or another, every significant piece of research of the decade built upon this new foundation.

And the scope of that research has been staggering, again recalling the sudden efflorescence of "new science" during the Renaissance. In 1971 James L. Kinneavy published his monumental Theory of Discourse (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), the harbinger of a new spirit of scientific inquiry. Frank O'Hare's Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing Without Formal Grammar Instruction (NCTE Research Report, No. 15) appeared the following year, a replication of John Mellon's pioneering study of Transformational Sentence-Combining (NCTE Research Report, No. 10) of 1969. Paul B. Diederich's Measuring Growth in English (Urbana, NCTE, 1974) presented a practical and reliable approach to evaluating writing holistically, while with Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Learning (London: Longman, 1974) Jack C. Richards set the stage for Ms. Shaughnessey's Errors and Expectations.

Throughout the decade, researchers have probed into the gray matter of writing and thinking: James W. Ney's "Notes towards a Psycholinguistic Model of the Writing Process" (RTE, 8 /Summer 1974/, 157-69); Frank D'Angelo's A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1975); Hirsch's Philosophy of Composition (1977); and Ms. Emig's own essay "Writing as a Mode of Learning" (CCC, 28 /May 1977/; 122-28). More recently, the work of Linda S. Flower and John R. Hayes has carried this spirit of inquiry into still new realms of thought.[3]

At the same time, other explorers have recharted the course of natural language development and proposed ways of accelerating that development.

Thus, in 1970 Kellogg W. Hunt published his Syntactic Maturity in Schoolchildren and Adults (Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, No. 134). [illegible] mid-decade James Britton published The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18) (London: Macmillan, 1975), and in 1976 Walter D. Loban completed his longitudinal study of Language Development: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (NCTE Research Report, No. 18). More recently, Max Morenberg, Donald Daiker, and Andrew Kerek of Miami University have brought the work of Hunt, Mellon, and O'Hare to the college classroom with impressive results, as reported in "Sentence Combining at the College Level: An Experimental Study" (RTE, 12 /Oct. 1978/, 245-56).

The list of such fruitful and fascinating research projects lengthens each year at an accelerating pace. Rather than belabor it further, however, I shall turn to an aspect of such inquiry which I find particularly exciting, since it indicates that, in the terms of Thomas S. Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1970), our discipline is evolving from a relatively inchoate, preparadigmatic enterprise toward the beginnings of a normal science. This new development is the increasingly urgent call for composition theory during the last five years--and the increasingly articulate answers to that call, which will continue beyond this day.[4]

Kinneavy's Theory of Discourse (1971) was indeed a book ahead of its time. About 1976, roughly a year after the publication of D'Angelo's Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric and a year before the appearance of Hirsch's Philosophy of Composition and Shaughnessy's Errors and Expectations, calls for systematic theories of composition began to resound through our journals. Thus, in the February 1976 issue of College Composition and Communication there appeared John Warnock's "Who's Afraid of Theory?" (pp. 16-20) and Glenn Matott's "In Search of a Philosophical Context for Teaching Composition" (pp. 25-31). In May there appeared Josephine Miles's "What We Already Know About Composition and What We Need to Know" (pp. 136-41) and Frank D'Angelo's "The Search for Intelligible Structure

in the Teaching of Composition" (pp. 142-47). In the wake of these appeared, of course, the manifestoes of Hirsch and Shaughnessy. Not that two such books could stop the revolution--they gave it momentum. Essays like Martha L. King's "Research in Composition: A Need for Theory" (RTE, 12 /Oct. 1978/, 193-202) and Nancy I. Sommers' "The Need for Theory in Composition Research" (CCC, 30 /Feb. 1979/, 46-49) continue to appear, as do the theoretical studies these authors call for. In this stage of development, the key word is "toward," as in these promising recent titles: Janice M. Lauer, "Toward a Metatheory of Heuristic Procedures" (CCC, 30 /Oct. 1979/, 268-69; Martha L. King and Victor Rentel, "Toward a Theory of Early Writing Development" (RTE, 13 /Oct. 1979/, 243-52); Caroline D. Eckhardt and David H. Stewart, "Towards a Functional Taxonomy of Composition" (CCC, 30 /Dec. 1979/, 338-42; and finally Stephen P. Witte, "Toward a Model for Research in Written Composition" (RTE, 14 /Feb. 1980/, 73-81).

How, one may ask, does such nascent theory apply to apprentice English teachers in the 1980s? I would answer that it applies to them directly. As Kuhn observes, "A paradigm is what the members of a scientific community share, and, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm" (p. 176). If we substitute the less scientismic word "theory" for "paradigm" in the passage, the implication for humanists is clear; a theory is what binds us together. It is because of the Copernican revolution in composition theory during the late 1970s that we find ourselves, as Michael T. Joyce recently put it, "Teaching Composition in a New Elizabethan Age" (CE, 39 /April 1978/, 894-902). In an essay entitled "Getting It Together in the English Department" (ADE Bulletin, No.55 /Nov. 1977/, 28-31, W. Ross Winterowd flatly stated that "Rhetorical studies at present are simply more interesting than literary studies" (p. 31). In the last five years, more and more established scholars like Hirsch and Lanham have begun to share this view, and more are converted to it every

year. Suddenly, we are all student-teachers, learning to teach, and teaching to learn anew.

Fortunately, our English teacher training programs have evolved along with our understanding of teaching and learning. We have come a long way from the time when essays like Charles Moyer's "Why I Gave Up Teaching Freshman English" (CE, 31 /Nov. 1969/, 196-74) were the norm. But where in the late 1960s and early 1970s English 101 seemed "so indistinct a situation" as to be an all-purpose blob, today the field threatens to splinter into its burgeoning sub-disciplines. The May 1980 issue of Writing Labs Newsletter lists fourteen universities now offering specialized doctorates in composition. While such specialization offers the advantages of in-depth knowledge, it also carries with it liabilities such as Professors Miller and Hirsch suggest: rigidity, vocationalism, and reductionism. As yet, no Francis Bacon has come on our scene with a Novum Organum for teaching. As yet, no Wellek and Warren have written an all-embracing Theory of Composition. The studies we call English remain an amalgam of art and science. And therein, I believe, lies their new energia. With this premise stated, I shall review developments in teacher training over the past ten years.

Charlton Laird fittingly kicked off the new decade with a new decalogue: "The New Ten Commandments for Teachers of Composition."[5] These included such revisionist rules as No. 4, "Thou shalt honor thy father, Thought, and thy mother, Language," and No. 8, "Thou shalt teach thy students not to steal." Unfortunately, as Laird himself feared, such an epiphany all too readily provokes the same reaction as its Mosaic original: "And when the people saw it, they removed, and stood afar off" (Gen. 20:18).

Then, in 1973, another prophetic soul, Francis Christensen, offered "The Course in Advanced Composition for Teachers" (CCC, 24 /May 1973/, 163-70),

based on his generative rhetoric and tailored to suit the 1967 NCTE Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English. Specifically, Christensen argued that a course "where composition embraces not only factual and imaginative writing but rhetoric" (p. 160) could grow out of students' work in grammar and history of the language.

While Christensen's was a promising curriculum, it essentially looked backward toward the "new" rhetorics of the 1960s. A more contemporary, more inclusive approach toward "Preparing the Composition Teacher" appeared in Donald Nemanich's essay by that title in the May 1974 CCC. Nemanich's program was threefold: "1) Students need experience writing various kinds of papers. 2) Students should read widely about composition and the teaching of composition. And 3) they should have experience planning to teach composition--planning a sequential program, making assignments, tutoring students, reading and grading papers, and teaching others how to improve their writing" (p. 48). This is exactly the kind of teacher training many of us received while serving as graduate assistants during the 1970s, and I believe that it has served us surprisingly well through revolutionary times.

In 1976 Janice M. Lauer put the matter into global terms in her essay "The Teacher of Writing" (CCC, 27 /Dec. 1976/, 341-43): "And we, the teachers of writing, find ourselves whirling in the vortex of three worlds--the world of rhetorical theory, the world of the classroom, and the world of our departments" (p. 341). Moreover, Lauer clearly grasped her position as a Renaissance woman in the midst of a Copernican revolution: "To stand still is to go backward, to be left behind. To go forward means engaging in our own research; it means keeping abreast of emerging theories; it means making creative applications of new ideas in our teaching; it means sharing knowledge with our colleagues" (p. 343). This is indeed teacher training for a

new Elizabethan age, and Ms. Lauer's own writing reflects its vitality.

Finally, I turn to a fourth essay, one which carries the global metaphor still farther, Richard C. Gebhardt's "Balancing Theory with Practice in the Training of Writing Teachers" (CCC, 28 /May 1977/, 134-40). Gebhardt calls on us to teach--and learn--four kinds of knowledge: 1) knowledge of the structure and history of the language; 2) knowledge of rhetoric; 3) knowledge of a theoretical framework for understanding our discipline; and 4) knowledge of reliable, productive teaching methods. This is, of course, a matter of becoming a Renaissance man or woman:

> Ideally, the student preparing to teach writing would master a world of knowledge that runs from transactional analysis to neat handwriting, from conventions of the sonnet to the pyramid structure of the news story, from the most venerated ideas of Aristotle to the most voguish ideas of the latest educational trend. (p. 134)

As a student-teacher from an earlier age wrote, "this is not a bow for every man to shoot in that counts himself a teacher, but will require sinews almost equal to those which Homer gave Ulysses. . . ."

Any resemblance between Gebhardt's proposal and John Milton's "Of Education" is, I believe, more than merely fortuitous. Furthermore, this correspondence brings me back to that all-embracing advertisement and to Professor Lanham, who recently published a piece entitled "Post-Darwinian Humanism" (in State of the Discipline, pp. 53-62). Such a humanism, which encompasses transactional analysis and sonnet structure, which outfits men and women for the new campus-wide writing program and at the same time demands of them first class literary training and intelligence, can indeed prepare students for teaching composition in a new Elizabethan age. Perhaps it can even prepare them for teaching English during the first stirrings of

a renaissance, a time not unlike that when Chaucer could praise a humble clerk of Oxford by saying "And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche."

The University of Hartford.

## Biographical Note

William L. Stull is Director of Writing and Assistant Professor of English at the University of Hartford. He has published essays on Renaissance poetry, American literature, and composition. Professor Stull's essay is revised from a paper delivered at the 1980 Wyoming Conference on Freshman and Sophomore English.

Notes

[1]See Martin Steinmann, Jr., ed., New Rhetorics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967).

[2]Consider, for example, these scholia to Errors and Expectations: John Rouse, "The Politics of Composition," CE, 41 (Sept. 1979), 1-12; Michael Allen. "Writing Away from Fear: Mina Shaughnessy and the Uses of Authority," CE, 41 (April, 1980), 857-67; Gerald Graff, "The Politics of Composition: A Reply to John Rouse," CE, 41 (April 1980), 851-56; and Rouse again, "Feeling Our Way Along," CE, 41 (April 1980), 868-75.

[3]See their studies of "Problem-Solving Strategies and the Writing Process" CE, 39 (Dec. 1977), 449-61; and "The Cognition of Discovery; Defining a Rhetorical Problem CCC, 31 (Feb. 1980), 21-32; as well as Ms. Flower's own "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing" CE, 41 (Sept. 1979), 19-37.

[4]The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd ed., Vol. 2, No. 2 of the International Encyclopedia of Unified Science (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970). See also Patricia Bizzel, "Thomas Kuhn, Scientism, and English Studies," CE, 40 (March 1979), 764-71).

[5]Rpt. in And Gladly Teche: Notes on Instructing the Natives in the Native Tongue (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 4-7.